

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 1-6 on six (6) sheets and new Fig. 13 on one (1) sheet. These sheets, which include Figs. 1-13, replace the original sheets including Figs. 1-12. In Figs. 1-12, only the page numbering has changed to reflect the addition of new Fig. 13.

New Fig. 13 does not introduce any new matter.

Attachments: Replacement Sheets (6)

New Sheet (1)

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action dated 13 April 2005. Applicant respectfully requests a one-month extension of time and reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claims 1-9, 13-18, 23-24, 26-27, 29, and 35-36 have been amended. New claims 37-42 have been added. Claims 9, 23, 24, and 29 have been amended only to put each in independent form and not for any reasons related to patentability. The amendments to claims 9, 23, 24, and 29 are not narrowing amendments. Thus, claims 9, 23, 24, and 29 retain their original scope. Accordingly, claims 1-42 remain pending in the application.

Interview of 9 August 2005

Applicant's representative interviewed the present case on 9 August 2005. The Examiner agreed to favorably reconsider the rejected claims, provided that the § 112 issues are overcome and the claims are amended to recite a pocket sized to hold aeronautical charts and/or a space for an aircraft pilot knee board. The Examiner also identified two additional prior art references, Shocket (U.S. Patent No. 2,612,199) and Adams (U.S. Patent No. 3,335,375). Therefore, Applicant has submitted a new PTO Form 1449 and requests that the Examiner acknowledge the newly identified additional references.

In the Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. As discussed in the interview,

the features of claims 5 and 26 are in fact clearly shown (claim 5 – see element 150 in Figs 2-3; claim 26 – see element 154 in Figs. 2-3). Claim 36 is a method claim, and although Applicant respectfully submits that elements of method claims do not normally require a drawing, in an effort to advance prosecution new Fig. 13 has been added. No new matter has been added.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

In the Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification because element “128” was used to describe both an inner surface and a base. While Applicant believes the references to “128” are correct, in an effort to advance prosecution of the case, the specification has been amended to overcome the objection.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

Response to Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claim 5 for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. However, as discussed in the interview, the elements of claim 5 are in fact fully enabled. *See* pp. 8-9.

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 16, 29, and 30 for being indefinite. The amendments made above fully address the indefinite rejections.

Response to Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 13-22, 25-28, and 31-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Chisholm (U.S. Patent No. 5,954,170), Dauphin et al. (PCT Application No. WO 92/01403), Hersh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,749,447), DeNigris, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 4,998,185), Storti (U.S. Patent No. 5,806,677), Callinicos (U.S. Patent No. 2,294,276), and Woodhouse (U.S. Patent No. 1,430,207) in various combinations. Applicant's attorney discussed the rejections with the Examiner in the 9 August 2005 interview, and the claims should be allowable in view of the amendments made above.


Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney if there are unresolved matters in the present application so that the examination process can be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12 AUGUST 2005

By: 

L. Grant Foster
Reg. No. 33,236